

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 430

September 15, 1995, 10:26 a.m.
Page S-13634 Temp. Record

WELFARE REFORM BILL/Community Works Progress Program

SUBJECT: Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995 . . . H.R. 4. Simon modified amendment No. 2468 to the Dole modified perfecting amendment No. 2280 to the committee substitute amendment.

ACTION: AMENDMENT REJECTED, 37-63

SYNOPSIS: As reported with a committee substitute amendment, H.R. 4, the Family Self-Sufficiency Act of 1995, will overhaul 6 of the Nation's 10 largest welfare programs.

The Dole modified perfecting amendment would strike the provisions of the committee substitute amendment and insert in lieu thereof substitute provisions, entitled "The Work Opportunity Act of 1995."

The Simon modified amendment would authorize \$240 million for a demonstration "community works progress" program. Funding would be provided for locally selected, governmental and non-profit community projects that would employ (generally at the higher of the Federal or State minimum wage) welfare recipients and other unemployed individuals. Certain able-bodied welfare recipients would be required to participate within 5 weeks of first receiving welfare. Projects would have to serve a significant public service in fields such as health, social service, environmental protection, education, welfare, recreation, or child care. States would list eligible projects in a State plan which would require Federal approval before funding would be provided.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

The Simon amendment is modeled on the Depression-era Work Projects Administration. It would set up a demonstration program to require welfare recipients, after 5 weeks of receiving welfare, to go to work 4 days per week on community projects. Those projects would be picked by local communities, and they would pay the minimum wage. On the 5th working day, program recipients would look for private sector employment. Our guess is that this demonstration project would prove to be effective in moving people rapidly off of welfare. We suspect that a major reason for the high crime and illegitimacy rates among welfare recipients is that they have nothing to occupy their time. If we give them work, and thus a chance to accomplish something, they may begin to hope to better

(See other side)

YEAS (37)			NAYS (63)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (36 or 78%)		Republicans (53 or 98%)	Democrats (10 or 22%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Brown	Akaka	Kennedy	Abraham	Hutchison	Baucus	EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE: 1—Official Buisiness 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay	
	Boxer	Kerry	Ashcroft	Inhofe	Biden		
	Bradley	Kohl	Bennett	Jeffords	Bingaman		
	Breaux	Lautenberg	Bond	Kassebaum	Exon		
	Bryan	Levin	Burns	Kempthorne	Ford		
	Bumpers	Lieberman	Campbell	Kyl	Glenn		
	Byrd	Mikulski	Chafee	Lott	Graham		
	Conrad	Moseley-Braun	Coats	Lugar	Kerrey		
	Daschle	Murray	Cochran	Mack	Leahy		
	Dodd	Nunn	Cohen	McCain	Moynihan		
	Dorgan	Pell	Coverdell	McConnell			
	Feingold	Pryor	Craig	Murkowski			
	Feinstein	Reid	D'Amato	Nickles			
	Harkin	Robb	DeWine	Packwood			
	Heflin	Rockefeller	Dole	Pressler			
	Hollings	Sarbanes	Domenici	Roth			
	Inouye	Simon	Faircloth	Santorum			
	Johnston	Wellstone	Frist	Shelby			
			Gorton	Simpson			
			Gramm	Smith			
			Grams	Snowe			
			Grassley	Specter			
			Gregg	Stevens			
			Hatch	Thomas			
			Hatfield	Thompson			
			Helms	Thurmond			
				Warner			

themselves and may consequently change their behavior. The Senate passed this amendment last year by voice vote. We urge our colleagues to again give it their approval.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

The idea behind the Simon amendment has merit. In fact, we have voted for the types of jobs programs that it advocates many times in the past. As a consequence, there are already several programs in existence today that could be used to fund the type of community projects envisioned by the Simon amendment. We would prefer to consolidate existing Federal job program efforts instead of throwing yet one more new program into the mix. Therefore, we urge the rejection of this amendment.